

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated January 26, 2005. Claims 1-6 are pending in the patent application. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Chambers et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,959,536 ("Chambers"). At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicant believes that the rejections raised in the Office Action have been overcome and thus should be withdrawn.

Of the pending claims at issue, claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Independent claim 1 recites an information signal device connected to a network including an event manager for directing messages generated by objects to destinations within and outside the signal device, a network messenger for transmitting messages to a specified destination on the network, and an broadcast manager for broadcasting messages having unspecified destinations to the network. The broadcast manager also receives broadcast messages (sent by other signal devices connected to the network) from the network. In this manner, messages generated by objects in the information signal device are delivered to their respective destinations without any discrimination by the objects as to whether the destinations of the messages are outside or inside the information signal device by exchanging the messages with the event manager in a one-to-one communication.

Applicant believes that Chambers fails to disclose or suggest at least a number of features of the claimed invention. For example, Applicant believes that Chambers at least fails to disclose a broadcast manager for broadcasting generated messages having unspecified destinations to the network as directed by the event manager. Messages generated by an object are delivered by exchanging the messages with the event manager in a one-to-one communication.

Contrary to claim 1, Chambers fails to disclose or suggest a broadcast manager. Instead, Chambers only discloses that a broadcast message is sent periodically, inviting new nodes to respond. Col. 11, ln. 55-56. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Patent Office's assertion in the Office Action at page 3 that the broadcast message in Chambers is equivalent to a broadcast manager as in the present claims. The broadcast manager in the present claims can receive a message from the broadcast client, and broadcast the message to the network via the transmission module. Additionally, the broadcast manager sends to the transmission module a

series of messages related to the broadcasting. The broadcast manager may also receive, via the transmission modules, a message that is broadcast to the network by another device and the message related to the broadcasting. The broadcast manager reports them both to the broadcast client. See, pg. 18, ln. 16 through pg. 19, ln. 1. In contrast, the broadcast message in Chambers is sent out by a network to invite new nodes to respond. A broadcast message may also be sent by a new node announcing its availability.

Clearly this suggests that the broadcast message in Chambers is sent and received by the network and/or the nodes. However, this fails to disclose or suggest a broadcast manager would transmit and/or receive messages from a device, a network, and an event manager. Moreover, nowhere in Chambers is a broadcast manger disclosed or even suggested.

Based on at least these reasons, Applicant believes that Chambers is distinguishable from the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejection be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4310

Dated: March 18, 2005